



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/656,264	09/06/2000	Richard Mark Schwartz	99-469	9095
32127	7590	11/29/2005	EXAMINER	
VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC. C/O CHRISTIAN R. ANDERSEN 600 HIDDEN RIDGE DRIVE MAILCODE HQEO3H14 IRVING, TX 75038			OPSASNICK, MICHAEL N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2655	
DATE MAILED: 11/29/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/656,264	SCHWARTZ ET AL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael N. Opsasnick	2655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 31-52 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4,6-30,53-55 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date .

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-30,53,54,⁵⁵ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta (6122361) in view of Kahn (6122614).

As per claims 1,17,21,29,30,53,54 and 55, Gupta (6122361) teaches an automated directory assistance system (abstract) comprising:

“a speech recognition module....audible request” as generating scripts from input speech (col. 6 lines 35-50);

“a listing retrieval module....transcript” as generating a list → fig. 3, subblocks 404-406;

“an accept/reject module....caller” as reworking the list (Fig. 3, subblock 416) and selecting the top 3 candidates (Fig. 3, subblock 418)..

Although Gupta (6122361) teaches generating a list, Gupta (6122361) does not explicitly teach generating a transcript; however, Kahn (6122614) teaches the operator generating transcripts of the user input (Kahn (6122614), col. 8 lines 20-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of operator system based services at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Gupta with operator based transcriptions because it would advantageously allow for editing of unmatched speech (Kahn (6122614), col. 2 lines 50-60).

The combination of Gupta (6122361) in view of Kahn (6122614) teaches using the transcript (Gupta (6122361), Fig. 3, dotted arrow off of 402) coming from the utterance (Fig. 3, subblock 400), however, does not explicitly teach storing the transcript to be used as a query; Schwartz et al (6668044) teaches access an archive for a database query (Fig. 7, subblocks 210,212, and 214). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of telephonic communications at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Gupta (6122361) in view of Kahn (6122614) with stored transcripts access a database because it would advantageously track information associated with the caller and the callee (col. 11 lines 45-55).

As per claim 2, Gupta (6122361) teaches a large speech recognizer (col. 8 lines 11-15);

As per claims 3,10,18,19,26, Gupta (6122361) teaches using acoustics and grammar models (col. 2 lines 28-32).

As per claims 4,11,25, Gupta (6122361) teaches the use of probability statistics (col. 2 lines 28-32).

As per claims 6,22, Gupta (6122361) teaches reordering and ranking (Fig. 3, subblock 416).

As per claims 7,12,23,27, Gupta (6122361) teaches acceptance/rejection based on a recognized word from the listing (fig. 2).

As per claims 8,24,28, Gupta (6122361) teaches transference to a human operator upon rejection (col. 8 line 65 – col. 9 line 3).

As per claim 9, Gupta (6122361) teaches a training system to configure the recognition modules as using orthographies that are configured/trained by certain utterances based on geography (col. 2 line 6-25) or as a first pass search (col. 2 lines 45-50, and col. 12 lines 38-44).

As per claim 13, Gupta (6122361) teaches generating transcripts based upon a priori probabilities and histograms (Fig. 3, subblocks 408,412).

As per claim 14, Gupta (6122361) teaches creating loose grammars and training the transcript according to the grammar (col. 2, lines 28-32)

As per claim 15, Gupta (6122361) teaches acceptance/rejection based upon recognition (fig. 2).

As per claim 16, Gupta (6122361) teaches a verification/correction module to a human for verification (col. 8 line 60 - col. 9 line 3).

As per claim 20, Gupta (6122361) teaches identifying words and telephone numbers (col. 10 lines 1-11).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. As per applicant's argument against the combination of the Gupta and Kahn references, examiner notes that both pieces of art are common to the art of operator assisted directory assistance.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Opsasnick, telephone number (571)272-7623, who is available Tuesday-Thursday, 9am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Wayne Young, can be reached at (571)272-7582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mmo
11/26/05



Michael N. Opsasnick
Examiner
Art Unit 2655